

Attending: Mikki Guest, Darcy Bragg, Josh Curtin, Paige Bragg, Brian Adler, Dongwen Qi, Andy Bosak, Peg Ellington, Keaton Wynn, Lisa Cooper, Ru Story Huffman

The meeting was called to order by Andy Bosak. The minutes were approved.

The members began with discussion of critical thinking, with Lisa Cooper providing review of the Assessment Day Results. She recommended we show why we picked the items from the NSSE/FSSE as focus and for recommendation. The critical thinking rubric was discussed as method to begin the recommendation from the IEC.

Discussion then moved to the function of the IEC, with it noted the IEC is to synthesize data and make recommendations, with CR 2.5 stating “the institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes.” The amount of details that are necessary when making a recommendation was discussed.

Brian Adler stated we need to make certain all loops are completed, with the IEC only making a recommendation, not to act as a development tool for implementation. The question arose on how to ensure a recommendation becomes an active charge to faculty.

Brian Adler stated SACS wants to see action on data and the IEC as evaluators of data. He stated the IEC could focus on a topic for 1-2 years, then refocus based on new data. He stated once the IEC has made recommendation, it goes to all faculty and staff. It was determined recommendations from the IEC first need to go before the Faculty Senate.

Lisa Cooper urged members to look at data, synthesize the data, and identify areas for recommendation based on results of data. She further stated we still need data from other resources and perhaps subcommittees need to evaluate data from their respective areas.

Brian Adler discussed assessment as only ½ of the objective, the University must take action. He stated GSW has data, although the loop is not being closed. He suggested we start with one recommendation and move forward.

Andy Bosak summarized critical thinking as direction for recommendation from the IEC.

Peggy Ellington spoke that critical thinking goes beyond academics and occurs in all aspects of the University.

Keaton Wynn asked for a timeline for reporting and deadline for a recommendation.

Brian Adler stated we need a “snapshot” by September 1, 2013.

Peggy Ellington suggested the IEC take some action and draft a recommendation.

Brian Adler stated that Bryan Davis has an assessment point in October for Academic Departments and June for Administrative. Perhaps a question on critical thinking could be part of the Annual Report.

Lisa Cooper stated since we've identified critical thinking based on data we could recommend each department include critical thinking in their strategic goals and seconded the idea as an element in the Annual Report.

Lisa Cooper suggested a draft recommendation as follows:

Based on assessment data generated by the NSSE and FSSE, we recommend institutional focus to strengthen and improve critical thinking. The IEC recommends an additional element added to the Annual Report template for institutional units to report critical thinking activities and assessment. Additionally, it is recommended units have goals for improving critical thinking for those not already doing so. The IEC will continue evaluation and determine how to measure and track critical thinking and assess unit attempted improvements.

Ru Story Huffman will send the summary to Andy Bosak and he will forward the statement to IEC members for recommendations at the 3/14/12 meeting.

Subcommittee representatives made reports and the meeting was adjourned at 5:07.

Respectfully submitted,

Ru Story Huffman